



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,650	10/09/2001	Peter J. Anslow	64457/159	6193
27220 7590 12/09/2008 BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON, LLP 45 O'CONNOR ST., 20TH FLOOR OTTAWA, ON K1P 1A4 CANADA				
EXAMINER PHAN, HANH				
ART UNIT 2613		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 12/09/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

[karen.forgie@blakes.com](mailto:karen.forgie@blakes.com)



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/973,650  
Filing Date: October 09, 2001  
Appellant(s): ANSLOW ET AL.

\_\_\_\_\_  
William M. Lee, Jr.  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 30 January 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 17 January 2006.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is incorrect. Based on the interview summary (October 30, 2006) applicant's representative agreed to including claim 9 along with the rejected claims in the appeal brief. Claim 9 and 20 should have been rejected since it is an apparatus claim for the method claimed in 1. A correct statement of the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 16-20, 27, and 28 are rejected.

Claims 15 and 26 allowed.

Claims 2-5, 7, 10-14, and 21-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5585954	Taga et al.	12-1996
5546325	Aulet et al.	8-1996
6320687	Ishikawa	11-2001
5325397	Scholz	6-1994

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

- a.** Claims 1, 6, 9, 20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taga et al. US 5,585,954 (Taga).

Regarding claims 1 and 9, Taga disclosed

A method of measuring the amplitude distortion component in an optical transmission signal subject to noise and amplitude distortion components, the method comprising determining the amplitude distortion component by analyzing the bit error ratio (BER) of the signal as a function of a movable decision threshold (e.g., Taga col. 4 lines 40-50). It is inherent that measuring Q

and S/N ratios is a measurement of noise and amplitude distortion.

Regarding claim 6 Taga disclosed

the step of providing said BER values by comparing the said signal with a said variable decision threshold (e.g., Taga col. 4 lines 40-50).

Regarding claims 20 and 27 Taga disclosed

An optical receiver comprising detector means to detect optical signals from an optical transmission system and convert them into their electrical equivalent, the receiver comprising measuring means to measure the amplitude distortion component in a said optical signal subject to noise and amplitude distortion components, the measuring means adapted to measure the amplitude distortion component by analysis of the bit error ratio (BER) of the signal as a function of a movable decision threshold (e.g., Taga col. 4 lines 40-50).

**b.** Claims 8, 16-19 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taga et al. US 5,585,954 (Taga) in view of Scholz et al. US 5,325,397 (Scholz).

Regarding claims 8, 16-19 and 28

Taga does not disclose a method performed by a programmed computer with a stored program. Scholz disclosed a computer that performs a BER rate detection

against thresholds (see Scholz e.g., 57 of Figure 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a processor to perform a BER threshold calculation because this would allow easy adjustment of the algorithm to fine tune the stored (60 of Figure 8) BER calculation method.

**c. New ground of rejection**

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claim 1 recites a determining step and claim 6 further recites a providing step to be performed, a statutory “process” under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. The instant claims neither transform underlying subject matter nor positively tie to another statutory category that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process.

Claim 16 is directed to the program per se. Program per se does not fall within any of the statutory categories. Therefore, it is non-statutory under 35 USC 101.

Claim 17 recites a carrier storing a program. The claimed carrier reasonably includes carrier wave, transmission or communication type of medium. Thus, treating claim 17 as a whole, it is claiming a signal. Signal per se does not fall within any of the statutory categories. Thus, it is non-statutory under 35 USC 101.

Claim 27 is claiming an optical signal. As discussed in claim 17, signal per se does not fall within any of the statutory categories. Thus, it is non-statutory under 35 USC 101.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

##### **Ground a and b:**

Applicant attempts to distinguish the claimed invention stating claiming that “noise and amplitude distortion components” is somehow different than what is taught in Taga U.S. 5,585,954.

First, examiner disagrees with the interpretation of point 2 found in the January 17, 2006 Final Rejection. The point is not that Taga measures the combined noise and amplitude distortion components, but that by measuring Q values one inherently measures an amplitude component. And by virtue of any type of signal distortion, one of ordinary skill in the art would characterize such distortion as noise.

To show that Q measurements inherently account for an amplitude distortion component, the following two references are cited. Aulet (USPN 5546325) discloses that Q measurements are directly related to noise, and hence BER. Formula 1 below,

$$Q = \frac{\text{receiver decision threshold level} - \text{mean of signal level}}{\text{standard deviation of signal level}} \quad (1)$$

found in Aulet, at the top of column 4, shows Q as a function of mean signal level. And mean signal level to one of ordinary skill in the art is taken to be equivalent to an amplitude component.

Art Unit: 2613

As yet another reference to show the inherent nature of amplitude measurement in Q values, Ishikawa (USPN 6320687), col./line(s): 9/45-60.

FIG. 29 is a diagram showing the definition of the Q value measured by Q value measuring system 42, according to an embodiment of the present invention. That is

$$Q=20 \log_{10}[(\mu_1-\mu_0)/(\sigma_1+\sigma_0)]$$

where

$\mu_1$ : average level during "emission"

$\mu_0$ : average level during "no emission"

$\sigma_1$ : standard deviation of level during "emission"

$\sigma_0$ : standard deviation of level during "no emission"

"The Q value is expressed using the signal level signal amplitude) between emission and no emission as the numerator and the sum difference (of the standard deviations of noise during emission and during no emission as the denominator."

From these two examples, should be readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art the when measuring Q values in an optical system one is naturally, measuring amplitude distortion and hence noise.

This examiner's answer contains a new ground of rejection set forth in section (9) **subsection 9(c)** above. Accordingly, appellant must within **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this answer exercise one of the following two options to avoid *sua sponte* **dismissal of the appeal** as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection:

(1) **Reopen prosecution**. Request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner by filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 with or without amendment,

Art Unit: 2613

affidavit or other evidence. Any amendment, affidavit or other evidence must be relevant to the new grounds of rejection. A request that complies with 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1) will be entered and considered. Any request that prosecution be reopened will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal.

(2) **Maintain appeal.** Request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41. Such a reply brief must address each new ground of rejection as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) and should be in compliance with the other requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c). If a reply brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.39(b)(2) is accompanied by any amendment, affidavit or other evidence, it shall be treated as a request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner under 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1).

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to the TWO MONTH time period set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.136(b) for extensions of time to reply for patent applications and 37 CFR 1.550(c) for extensions of time to reply for ex parte reexamination proceedings.

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Art Unit: 2613

Respectfully submitted,

/Hanh Phan/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2613

Conferees:

/David C. Payne/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611

/Jason Chan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2613

/Mark R. Powell/

Director, TC 2600